

Colliander, Helena; Nordmark, Sofia

Teachers' approaches to teaching for social inclusion in second language education for adult migrants

European journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults 14 (2023) 3, S. 397-410



Quellenangabe/ Reference:

Colliander, Helena; Nordmark, Sofia: Teachers' approaches to teaching for social inclusion in second language education for adult migrants - In: *European journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults* 14 (2023) 3, S. 397-410 - URN: urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-280123 - DOI: 10.25656/01:28012; 10.3384/rela.2000-7426.4653

<https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0111-pedocs-280123>

<https://doi.org/10.25656/01:28012>

in Kooperation mit / in cooperation with:



<http://www.ep.liu.se>

Nutzungsbedingungen

Dieses Dokument steht unter folgender Creative Commons-Lizenz: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.de> - Sie dürfen das Werk bzw. den Inhalt vervielfältigen, verbreiten und öffentlich zugänglich machen sowie Abwandlungen und Bearbeitungen des Werkes bzw. Inhaltes anfertigen, solange Sie den Namen des Autors/Rechteinhabers in der von ihm festgelegten Weise nennen.

Mit der Verwendung dieses Dokuments erkennen Sie die Nutzungsbedingungen an.

Terms of use

This document is published under following Creative Commons-License: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.en> - You may copy, distribute and render this document accessible, make adaptations of this work or its contents accessible to the public as long as you attribute the work in the manner specified by the author or licensor.

By using this particular document, you accept the above-stated conditions of use.



Kontakt / Contact:

peDOCS
DIPF | Leibniz-Institut für Bildungsforschung und Bildungsinformation
Informationszentrum (IZ) Bildung
E-Mail: pedocs@dipf.de
Internet: www.pedocs.de

Teachers' approaches to teaching for social inclusion in second language education for adult migrants

Helena Colliander

Linköping university, Sweden (helena.colliander@liu.se)

Sofia Nordmark

Linköping university, Sweden (sofia.nordmark@liu.se)

Abstract

Adult education has been used as a means to enhance citizens' opportunities to participate and be included in society, but adult education may also construe students as excluded. This study focuses on how teachers in second language education for migrants conceptualise and enact teaching for social inclusion. It draws on Fraser's concept of social justice and Biesta's aims of sound education. The article is based on observations and interviews with teachers. The findings highlight that the teaching is enacted to develop the students' language skills for formal qualification and everyday life as well as their knowledge of Civics and norms in Swedish society. Thus, conceptualising the students as emerging participants, lacking skills and knowledge as language users and citizens. This teaching enactment reflects qualification and socialisation as central aims of education, but less of subjectification processes. Consequently, social inclusion is conceptualised as migrants adjusting to society in predefined ways.

Keywords: social inclusion, adult education, second language teaching, teachers' approaches

Introduction

In the Nordic Welfare state model, as represented in Sweden, Denmark, and Finland there is a long tradition of adult education as a means to enhance participation and inclusion in society (Kuusipalo et al., 2021). Social inclusion, however, has been used as a concept with various agendas over time, both as demands for social rights and as a justification of

ISSN 2000-7426

© 2023 The authors

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

<http://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.4653>

www.rela.ep.liu.se



social and moral regulation of individuals to adapt and contribute to society (Spandler, 2007). Participating in adult education does not, per se, lead to social inclusion. Adult education directed toward specific groups to meet societal expectations for example by being active and self-supporting (Fejes, 2010) reflects how education implies moral regulation. Furthermore, students are construed from a deficit perspective (cf. Kloubert & Dickerhoff, 2020). Previous studies have further problematised how students within adult education are conceptualised from a deficit perspective which may infantilize the students and exclude rather than include them (Franker, 2007; Hoffman et al., 2021; Wildemeersch & Koulaouzides, 2022). Given the vagueness and the paradox between social rights and regulations that are underlying the use of adult education as means of social inclusion, we investigate teaching for social inclusion in, second language education of adult migrants.

Second language education for migrants has been seen as a key to social inclusion and as a sign of migrants' willingness to adapt to the new country (Ahlgren & Rydell, 2020; Blackledge, 2009; Rosén & Bagga-Gupta, 2013; Rydell & Milani, 2020). However, being included in a new country is also dependent on the access one has to communities where the language is spoken (Dahlstedt et al., 2021). Our analysis, therefore, draws on an understanding of social inclusion that comprises rights as well as redistribution of resources needed to participate, representation in different social contexts as well as recognition (Fraser, 2005).

This study examines Swedish for Immigrants (SFI), the formal introductory language education for adult migrants. Since SFI was founded in 1965, it has been seen on the one hand from a humanistic perspective, facilitating migrants' participation in society, on the other hand, from an instrumental understanding of second language education as a way to reduce the time it takes for migrants to establish in Swedish society and more specifically the labour market (Lindberg & Sandwall, 2007) SFI, therefore, is expected to be an efficient education in terms of student intake and completion rate, and to meet the various backgrounds and needs of a heterogeneous group of students.

The curriculum of SFI states that the purpose of education is to develop students' language for participation in work, further studies, life within society, and everyday life. Moreover, linguistic goals are stipulated in the syllabus, but the content and methods are less specified (cf. The Swedish National Agency of Education, 2018). This enables the teachers to make their own pedagogical choices when interpreting how to enable students' participation. Our research interest lies with teachers, who enact SFI education through their teaching. This study aims to examine how teachers conceptualise and enact teaching for social inclusion in second language education for adults. We ask the following questions:

- How is SFI teaching enacted for enabling social inclusion?
- How is social inclusion through adult second language education conceptualised by the teachers?
- How are SFI students conceptualised in relation to social inclusion?

Second language teaching and social inclusion

Previous studies of the second language teaching of adults have included aspects of how the teaching can include or exclude students. One research aspect is how second language teaching connects to the students' everyday lives and life within society. There are examples of how second language teachers consider the students' contexts in their teaching (e.g. Colliander et al., 2018), but also of how little consideration is given to what

the students bring into the classroom. The latter implies that students' opportunities to link their everyday literacy practices to the literacy practices in the classroom are limited and, therefore, that they cannot connect things they learned in their studies to activities outside school (Norlund Shaswar, 2014). Moreover, international studies, and studies of the Swedish SFI alike, show that to support migrant students' participation in society, the teacher must be learner-centred and integrate the students' everyday lives with their abilities to exercise their citizenship (e.g. Slade & Dickson, 2021; Wedin et al., 2018). Nonetheless, studies of SFI students show that students' opinions about the teaching are not acknowledged (Carlson, 2004), that their cultural backgrounds and experiences are not much considered (Lundgren, 2005), and that there are few authentic questions directed toward them (Colliander & Fejes, 2020).

The use of language in teaching is another issue that can either include or exclude students in the educational setting. There are examples of how students' multilingual abilities are being acknowledged as a resource in teaching (cf. Rosén & Bagga-Gupta, 2015; Wedin et al., 2018); however, the idea that students' multilingual interaction prevents them from learning a second language sustains a monolingual norm in many classrooms (Rosén & Bagga-Gupta, 2015; Rydell, 2015). Moreover, the opportunities for students to speak the target language during the lessons are central to their language learning process. By conducting more of the teaching activities in smaller groups rather than in the whole class, the students would be given a greater oral space (Norlund Shaswar & Wedin, 2019).

Teachers' approaches to second language students also condition the opportunities for inclusion. Cowie & Delaney (2019) illustrate how, in classroom practice, information about the host country's society can be presented either as facts and with language development as the main purpose or carried out intending to encourage the students to ascribe to certain values. When focusing on adjusting the students to the new country, teachers can limit the students' learning agency (Pötzsch, 2020), and language courses which do not live up to students' expectations can be perceived as limiting and patronising, instead of having an empowering effect (Hoffman et al., 2021). Zachrisson (2014) shows that students experienced alienation when they used Swedish inside (and outside) the classroom since the teaching was based on a monocultural norm, with greater emphasis on 'thinking like a good Swede' than on 'speaking good Swedish' (p. 230). When representatives of the majority society within, for example, language education do not critically introspect their ideas about culture, learning, and integration, the structures behind exclusion are not challenged (Pötzsch, 2020). Second language teachers have, unintentionally, been observed to infantilise students by underestimating their capacity (Franker, 2007), and teachers, as well as policymakers, have described the students from a deficit perspective, i.e. as weak, ignorant of what it means to be part of the society and, therefore, in need of fostering (Carlson, 2002). These studies show that teaching which positions students as lacking, implies exclusion. In Carlson's study (2002), the students refused the stereotypical descriptions of them as ignorant and vulnerable, and, thus, the fostering intentions acquired a boomerang effect. Through being stereotyped, the students experienced alienation rather than inclusion. Despite these experiences, however, they acknowledged that, through their participation in second language education, they did develop more self-confidence and abilities to act in their everyday lives. Consequently, second language education can work both against and towards students' social inclusion, regardless of the norms behind the teaching.

While Carlson's study was made two decades (in 2002) ago, more recent studies which focus on the Civic Orientation program – a course for newly arrived adult migrants run in parallel to SFI – give a similar picture. Bauer et al. (2023) show that the Swedish

society, in this type of education, was presented, as opposed to the participants' countries of origin, in a non-problematised way and a positive light. Furthermore, Abdulla (2017) and Milani et al., (2021) illustrate that the teaching aimed to socialise migrants to a certain Swedish way of behaving and that the migrants responded differently to these attempts, either by resistance or compliance.

Bacquet (2020) suggests an alternative approach to teaching second language education by facilitating students to engage in practices that encourage them to develop their identities, become empowered, and be able to invest in language learning for the sake of their futures. For example, he suggests that this could be done by teachers creating collaborative relationships with the students to counteract the hierarchy in the classroom, encouraging and supporting students to actively participate in classroom activities as well as in language learning activities outside the school context.

Even if research on second language teaching relates to inclusion, few studies focus on how teaching is organised to achieve the explicit purpose of social inclusion. This question, however, will be addressed in this study.

Analytical framework

As a starting point for this article, we draw on Fraser's (2010) understanding of social exclusion as a social injustice that occurs when society is organised in ways that hinder groups to participate on equal terms. Fraser (1987; 1989) uses the concept of needs interpretation to highlight how societal initiatives aimed toward different groups are shaped by assumptions or ideas about their needs. In this article, we draw on needs interpretation to analyse second language teaching to enable social inclusion based on the teachers' conceptualisation of social inclusion and the SFI students. Furthermore, Fraser (2005) suggests a model based on three dimensions of social justice and possibilities for members of a society to participate as equals in social life. The three dimensions are redistribution (of socioeconomic resources), recognition (of one's interests and ways of living), and representation (to be seen as a relevant member in specific societal contexts). In this paper, we discuss how and if teaching for social inclusion in second language education contributes to the students' inclusion through the dimensions of redistribution, representation, and recognition.

To analyse social inclusion and the specific context of education, we draw on Biesta's criticism of the use of education for specific societal aims. Biesta's (2010; 2018) concept of learnification illustrates how the discourse on learning implies a duty for adults to learn to adapt to society. Learnification enables us to see how teachers conceptualise students' knowledge and needs in relation to goals of SFI and what it means to be included. According to Biesta (2018), learning is a judgment of an event rather than a neutral process of change. There is someone who determines what is desirable to learn and what specific change that is regarded as learning. Säfström and Biesta (2011) argue that education should not be understood as a movement from what is to what is not yet, as an attempt to form the student in a particular way. Instead, one should concentrate on what happens in the tension between *what is there*, and *what is not*, and where the latter is something new and undefined.

Biesta (2010) discusses the potential of democratisation through education and defines three aims of sound education: to qualify students through the development of skills, knowledge, and dispositions, to support their socialisation, whereby humans become a part of different social practices, and to help them form and transform their personalities in the process of subjectification. Through subjectification, students become autonomous by, independently, orienting themselves and driving their actions (Biesta,

2018). Qualification, socialisation, and subjectification are intertwined. However, Biesta (2010) gives the concept of subjectification particular significance. By engaging in democratic processes, inside and outside the school, students develop as democratic citizens, in a subjectification process where they can break into the world and be part of and contribute rather than merely adjust to society (Biesta, 2010). We use the concepts of subjectification, socialisation, and qualification to analyse how teaching enacted in different ways shapes different opportunities for students to be and become included.

Research context and method

SFI, the formal introductory language education for migrants in Sweden, is part of the municipal adult education in which students can complete primary and secondary education. SFI is offered to adult migrants with a residence permit in Sweden. In SFI, there are three study tracks, based on the students' educational background. In Study track 1, students with little or no schooling are enrolled, whereas study track 3 is directed towards students with experience of university studies, while study track 2 is for students in between. All three study tracks are represented in this study, and the sample of the study is taken from two SFI schools in two different municipalities.

The study design is inspired by an ethnographic approach, in the sense that we have collected different types of qualitative data (cf. Hammersley & Atkinson, 2007): from observations of teachers' work (particularly their teaching), semi-structured interviews with teachers. Some data were collected in October 2018 and the majority during the autumn of 2019.

In total, the work of seven teachers was observed. Field notes were taken during the observations, they contained 57 pages and were based on 39 hours of classroom activities and a smaller amount of time observing the teachers' work outside the classroom before and after class. During the observations, we had the opportunity to ask informal questions about the teaching. The observations helped us to gain familiarity with how the teachers enacted the teaching in practice.

Moreover, we interviewed eight teachers, the ones whose teaching was observed, plus one additional teacher. The interviews focused on how they taught second language education, the conditions of the teaching, and the potential they saw that their teaching had for students' social inclusion. The teachers, all women, were formally qualified. Most had worked with the education of children or youth before they had supplemented their teacher education with a qualification for second language teaching. The interview questions focused on the teaching, how the teachers interpreted their teaching mission, the students' potential, and the aims and conditions of SFI education. The study is part of a larger research programme on migration, language learning and social inclusion, in which also municipal leaders, principals, and students have been interviewed, too. These interviews are not included in the analysis of this article but have served, indirectly, to contextualise the teachers' answers.

The larger research program has been ethically approved by the Swedish Ethical Review Authority, and the study follows the ethical recommendations stated by the Swedish Research Council. The participants were informed about the purpose of the study, how the data were to be treated, and that they could withdraw their participation at any time. Both teachers and students were granted confidentiality and gave written and oral consent to participate.

We analysed field notes from observations of the teaching and the interviews. By analysing these materials together, we could capture how the teachers talked about their teaching and some examples of how the teaching was done. The data were analysed

thematically (cf. Braun & Clarke, 2006). First, we familiarised ourselves with the material. The codes we identified in the data were sorted into tentative themes, which were reviewed repeatedly in relation to the notions of social inclusion. In the first stage, we elaborated themes that lay close to the empirical material, of 'perceived learning needs for inclusion' and 'teaching activities/actions for inclusion' to capture different aspects of teaching such as content and activities, the needs of the students and learning goals. Later in the process, the concepts of qualification, socialisation, and subjectification were used to further analyse how the teachers conceptualised different aspects of teaching for social inclusion through second language education. From this analysis, the themes of 'teaching language for qualification and participation', 'teaching civics and norms for participation' and 'conceptualising students as emerging participants' emerged. Moreover, we use Fraser's concepts of needs interpretation, redistribution, representation, and recognition to discuss the potentiality of teaching second language education for social inclusion.

To illustrate the findings, we selected quotations from the interviews and excerpts from the field notes and translated them from Swedish to English. We selected the quotations and field notes representing recurrent themes and the different teachers participating in the study.

Findings

In this section, we show how the teachers conceptualise adult second language education and SFI students and how they enact teaching in relation to these conceptualisations. To illustrate this, we present themes of teaching language, teaching civics and norms and conceptualising students as emerging participants.

Teaching language for qualification and participation

From the observed teaching and the teacher interviews, it appeared that a central part of the SFI teaching was to provide the students with formal language qualifications. This is seen in how the teachers, in line with the Curriculum of SFI (cf. the Swedish National Agency of Education, 2018), in their teaching focused on developing students' abilities to understand and use the Swedish language. In the observations, the teaching focused on grammar, the meaning of words, listening comprehension, speaking activities, and reading and writing. An example is seen in the following fieldnotes in which the students work with an old national exam:

When the students had listened to the audio recording twice, they were to discuss their different answers, including "Why are your answers the right ones and the others wrong"? . . . Two groups start to talk with each other. They have different views on if the first or the sending statement is the right one . . . When the teacher, Eva, notices that the answers differ, she explains that they try to be tricky in the exams of the D course by including information about everything. "One must look at the question itself! She shows a written version of the audio-recorded text on the smart board and reads it and underscores the right alternatives or the information that gives clues to the right answers

(Fieldnotes, 30th of October 2019)

The lesson activity above shows that the students were to practise listening and talking as well as reading some pre-given questions. At the same time, however, the teacher, Eva, also strived to prepare the students for the formal exams by aligning the teaching content to the knowledge and skills, e.g., understanding the logic of tests, which she knew were

typically exams. She was not the only teacher who was teaching for the test. Essential time was assigned in observed lessons time to pre-testing students and/or going through test results as preparation for the formal examination. In the interview, Eva talked about the importance of this, by giving an example of two students who had lived in Sweden for a long time without entering SFI studies and who, repeatedly, had failed national examinations in the Swedish language. It was not until they became enrolled in SFI, they learned the logic behind the examinations and, consequently, how to pass them. This example, as well as the teaching for test activities, highlight the importance teachers assigned to teaching for students' formal qualifications governed by predefined goals (cf. Biesta, 2010).

However, in addition to the focus on formal qualifications, the teachers also highlighted the need for the students to develop the students' functional language knowledge and skills for participating in everyday life.

You're to be able to speak when you go to the employment agency, to speak with the doctor, you need to go shopping. You must go to the housing office or wherever you turn to talk about your accommodation. These things are what you need to learn first. And to even get there (to these places), you need to read the signposts. (Klara)

The quotation reflects the view of the Swedish language as a condition for participating in everyday life and various societal institutions outside school. A similar idea was reflected in the teachers' choices of teaching material during the observations, and how they said that they chose teaching examples resembling real-life situations and objected to the fact that some parts of the examinations tested language skills they did not see as relevant to students' lives.

More abstract parts of the teaching, such as grammar instructions, were also regarded as functional by the teachers. Eva said that she wanted to provide the students with tools to use independently when using Swedish after completing their SFI education. That was the given reason why she integrated grammar instruction with reading and speaking exercises and strived to explain the principles behind the Swedish language. Another teacher, Ella, who was seen to teach grammar as a separate part of the lesson, had a similar view of the results of grammar teaching. She said about the use of the grammatical scheme she used in instruction 'One is not constantly thinking about the grammatical scheme. But when one knows, and something feels strange . . . then one can make use of the scheme.'

The strivings for supporting students' functional language knowledge and skills and independence are also reflected in the method of genre pedagogy, which Klara said that she applied. This approach aims to give students examples of a certain type of text, and then let them write such a text together with the teachers and peers before reaching the goal of doing it by themselves.

From the findings described above, SFI teaching is conceptualised as something which should prepare the language students for passing exams, and by doing so qualify students for further studies and/or employment. Moreover, the findings illustrate how the teachers expressed the importance of teaching to develop a language useful for everyday life. To achieve this the teachers strived to socialise the students into different learning and language practices by using genre pedagogy and certain grammar instructions. A potential for subjectification (cf. Biesta, 2018) can be seen in the ambitions to support students in becoming more independent as language users. However, this potential depends on how predefined the teachers' conceptualisations of the students' needs to become independent language users are, and if the teaching enables a learning process where the students discover and impact which knowledge and skills they want to develop

(cf. Säfström & Biesta, 2011). Moreover, the teaching does also hold the potential to achieve social justice (cf. Fraser, 2005), since it provides the students with formal qualifications and language skills, which we choose to see as linguistic resources, crucial for participation, and consequently also representation e.g. in working life. The formal qualification does also appear as a way to be recognised as a language learner.

Teaching civics and norms for participation

During the interviews, the teachers talked about SFI teaching not solely as teaching for language development but also as teaching civics and norms for participation in Swedish society. The teaching, too, held content and activities specifically chosen to prepare the students for participation in various contexts. The lessons observed included e.g. a study visit at a leisure time activity centre, information about famous Swedish people, talk about what Swedish people often do on Friday nights and how to make small talk. One central aspect of how the teachers talked about participation was the importance of getting a job:

What tools can we give them, so that they can get a job? What do you need to know? . . . What types of professions are there here in Sweden? How do you apply for a job? How do we write a CV? These are relevant things . . . how a job interview is carried out. We practise job interviews because many of the students have never been in an interview since it doesn't work like that in their homelands. (Erika)

This quotation shows a will to teach the students about the Swedish labour market and the job application process. Such a strive was moreover seen in one of Erika's lessons where her students were asked to speak in pairs about which personality traits and characteristics, they would use to present themselves and how to express this in Swedish during a job interview. The different qualities were later listed on the blackboard, followed by a discussion in class on how words might be interpreted as either positive or negative depending on the situation and what characteristics and words would be most appropriate to use when applying for a job. Such an exercise illustrates how the teaching of vocabulary was linked to work life, but also how teaching language use also implies teaching norms of Swedish working life.

In the interviews, the teachers also talked explicitly about the need for teaching norms crucial for students to learn in order to get a job in Sweden, for example, not letting job seeking be limited by gender patterns since both men and women were supposed to work, the importance of being on time for work, and to take part in informal small talk and coffee breaks. In that sense, teaching could comprise both instructive and fostering elements, which both served to inform about Swedish work life and to socialise the students by fostering specific values, attitudes and behaviours (cf. e.g. Carlson, 2002; Zachrison, 2014). Teaching in ways that offer a possibility for the students to reflect on the information and contribute to how it should be understood in relation to their future decisions could be seen as subjectification (Biesta, 2010), to break into the world as subjects using the knowledge and being able to orient oneself in relation to society. However, if teaching doesn't allow the students to make sense of the information in relation to their previous experiences, the teaching tends to foster the students in specific predefined directions to adjust to Swedish society.

Another example of how teaching comprised both a civic content and a strive to foster certain ways of living is seen in the following transcript where two teachers were interviewed together:

We have talked about the money issue . . . How does it work with money? . . . Because one must understand. How do I get funding? "I work here and get my salary. You get your financial support from the health insurance office or the social welfare office or whatever." What type of money is that? One tries to make them understand that "you are welcome here because we want you to be here. But it is a lot of money". (Linda)

One tries to encourage them. It is important for you and your family that you develop your Swedish . . . that you can live here, and that you can start to pay back and take part in society . . . get a job . . . buy your children's food and feels that "I have paid for this myself". (Hilda)

In this example, the teachers say that they wish to teach the students about the welfare system in Sweden, but at the same time also convey norms of how citizens in return are expected to work, provide for themselves, and pay taxes. In this sense, the redistribution of resources through the welfare system is conditioned by certain ways of being members of society, such as speaking the majority language, working, and paying taxes. Following the line of reasoning about teaching civic content and norms, inclusion appears as something possible only in the future and if students learn and adjust to society.

Conceptualising the students as emerging participants

In the interviews, the teachers conceptualise the students based on their knowledge of the students' educational background and approaches to studies. Students with little education, health issues, or of an older age, were depicted as less likely to complete their studies. Well-educated students were described as motivated and fast learners, who completed their courses and aimed at skilled work or higher education. Eva, for example, meant that SFI could 'be a quick way if one is motivated to study and can learn quickly'. Thus, students were conceptualised as closer to or further away from being socially included.

The students were also conceptualised through the choices of how to teach. The teaching activities observed implied that the students were to mainly listen, do fill-in exercises, or use ready-made phrases. Thus, the teaching offered few opportunities for students to use the language authentically and connected to their own experiences. During the interviews, only one teacher explicitly talked about bringing in students' experiences:

You must talk about their experiences and what they have done before they came here and then associate it with the teaching and do things with it. And to write, if you write together or if you talk about pictures, you must talk about them [the students] to bring their experiences into school for them to understand. (Klara)

The teacher in this quotation highlights the importance of the students' previous experiences to facilitate their learning. Still, experiences, however, are presented as a source for the teacher to relate the teaching content to the students, not as a way for students to participate fully, by expressing themselves and making sense of the content.

The teachers also conceptualised the students in relation to the world outside the classroom when describing teaching activities such as reading/watching the news and making study visits in the local society:

Many [students'] knowledge of the surrounding world in Sweden is very limited. One notices that when doing things outside the school. "What! Is it a park here? And it's not far from where I live. I'll bring my children here." Thus, I think SFI plays an important role in helping them discover the local area. Many just go home directly from school to wherever they live and then they come to school. So, I believe that we have an important part to play,

to show them. We usually go to the concert hall (. . .) or visit museums to show alternatives of what they can do. (Stina)

The quotation reflects the idea of using study visits as a teaching activity to offer knowledge about society and encourage students to take part in leisure time activities. The latter was linked to a conceptualisation, reflected in the interviews, of the students as lacking knowledge about public spaces, activities, and the importance of leisure time activities for well-being. This type of teaching activity reflects a conceptualisation of students as in need of information and guidance for actively taking part in society in predefined ways (cf. Säfström & Biesta, 2011). Another teacher, Mirja, talked about encouraging students to become democratic citizens. She strived to be a role model herself, in terms of talking to the students about how to 'think, reflect and reason' as an experienced citizen in 'a democratic country'. She wanted to show the students that she was familiar with traditions from other countries and to use that knowledge as a starting point in her teaching:

It can help them to be more motivated in understanding the Swedish mindset and tradition when they see that there is an exchange [of ideas] (. . .) You must be prepared so that you may live here. And then, we don't want you to only sit at home, but to be active and participate, to be a democratic citizen.

The quotation reflects a conceptualisation of students as not knowing what it is to be a democratic citizen. In her teaching, therefore, she wants to urge students to take part in contexts outside of home and school. Her statements illustrate how teaching towards these predefined goals, comprises an approach to students and social inclusion which does not recognize students' knowledge and experiences of democracy (cf. Fraser, 2005). A similar approach to socialise students towards taking responsibility, being active, and participating in social contexts was articulated by Hilda, who talked about teaching a group of female participants:

It has to do with gender equality and to dare speak up in public. That you, as a woman also can and should make yourself heard. And that in a society where both men and women are working, we are better off. Women are important in politics (. . .) We talk a lot about the importance of women taking part in decisions in the parliament, if we want to have a society, live in peace, and invest in hospitals, schools, and preschools instead of spending money on wars.

When urging the students to participate, Hilda uses the word 'we' in a way that includes both her and the students as responsible for society. Another teacher, Erika, who also used the words 'we' did differently, however. She talked about how 'we' may feel insecure and awkward when speaking another language, which conceptualises the students as equal to her and others in second language learning.

Overall, there is an emphasis in the teachers' conceptualisations of the students as a 'they' in need of both increased knowledge and socialisation to actively take part in various social contexts such as working life and politics to become included. Given that migrant social inclusion is dependent on representation and recognition of their experiences, the potentiality of SFI teaching depends on how the experiences are used and by whom (cf. Fraser, 2005).

Concluding remarks

The results illustrate that teachers conceptualise and enact teaching for social inclusion in second language education for adults in relation to their interpretations of the students and their needs to be included. SFI teaching is enacted by focusing on language skills for formal qualification and everyday life as well as civics and norms for adjusting to Swedish society. Furthermore, even if the students are conceptualised differently depending on how far they are from the predefined goals of further studies and work, there is an overall tendency to regard them as emerging not only as language learners, but also as citizens lacking the skills, knowledge, norms, and behaviour needed to be included (cf. Kloubert & Dickerhoff, 2020).

The teaching investigated in this study can be understood as attempts to socialising students towards a specific type of adult citizen in line with societal aims, e.g. by being employable and adjusting to a certain type of life as an active citizen taking responsibility (Fejes, 2010; Säfström & Biesta, 2011). Language learning in this sense is regarded as a means, an investment to fulfil these obligations (cf. Flubacher et al., 2018). Moreover, our results show that there are few examples of teaching based on students' explicit experiences (cf. e.g. Lundgren, 2005) and that students are not given much space for agency in their learning (cf. Pötzsch, 2020; Zachrisson, 2014). Thus, in Biesta's wording, the students are not allowed to 'break in' into society through subjectification processes in the classroom. Qualification and socialisation become superior to the aims of subjectification in teaching and social inclusion is conceptualised as something taking place in the future given that the students adjust to certain moral regulations of migrants (cf. Spandler, 2007). Social inclusion in this sense, emphasises the individual's responsibility to change. However, as previously discussed, teaching for enabling social inclusion could be conceptualised in other ways. From a social justice perspective (cf. Fraser, 2010), the emphasis of the teaching would rather e.g. be on recognising migrants as already capable, and enabling their active participation both within and outside education. Likewise, if the teaching was enacted in ways that consider all three aims of subjectification qualification and socialisation, it would offer greater opportunities for students to, autonomously, apply the knowledge and skills. Such an approach would recognise the students as already included and open the space between the already existing and the undefined possibilities for the future (cf. Säfström & Biesta, 2011).

Declaration of conflicting interests

The authors declare no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship or publication of this article.

Funding

The project this article is based on was partly financed by the Centre for Local Government Studies (CKS) at Linköping University and by the Swedish Research Council Ref. 2019–03902.

Acknowledgement

We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their helpful comments on earlier drafts of this article.

References

- Abdulla, A. (2017). *Readiness or resistance? - Newly arrived adult migrants' experiences, meaning-making, and learning in Sweden*. Department of Behavioral Sciences and Learning, Linköping university.
- Ahlgren, K. & Rydell, M. (2020). Continuity and change: migrants' experiences of adult language education in Sweden. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 11(3), 399-414. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.ojs1680>
- Bacquet, G. (2020). Can the Dimensions of Identity, Investment and Empowerment Increase Social Inclusion for Second-language Learners? – Moving Towards the Creation of a Conceptual Framework. *International Journal of Education & Literacy Studies*, 8(2), 10-15.
- Bauer, S., Von Brömsen, K., Milani, T. M. & Spehar, A. (2023). Locating Sweden in Time and Space: National Chronotopes in Civic Orientation for Adult Migrants. *Nordic Journal of Migration Research*, 13(1), Article 7. <https://doi.org/10.33134/njmr.489>
- Biesta, G. (2010). *Good education in an age of measurement: Ethics, Politics, Democracy*. Paradigm Publishers.
- Biesta, G. (2018). Interrupting the politics of learning. In K. Illeris (Ed.), *Contemporary Theories of Learning* (pp. 243-259). Routledge.
- Blackledge, A. (2009). Being English, speaking English. Extension to English – language testing legislating and the future of multicultural Britain. In G. Hogan-Brun, C. Mar-Molinero & P. Stevenson (Eds.), *Discourses on language and integration* (pp. 83–107). Johan Benjamins.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Carlson, M. (2002). *Svenska för invandrare – brygga eller gräns? Syn på kunskap och lärande inom sfi-undervisningen*. [Swedish language courses for immigrants (SFI) – bridge or border?] Göteborgs universitet.
- Carlson, M. (2004). Att komma till tals eller inte – Om 'kunskapsdiskussion' i SFI-undervisningen [To be heard or not – About knowledge discussion in the SFI teaching]. I Borevi, K. & Strömblad, P. (Eds.), *Kunskap för integration – om makt i skola och utbildning i mångfaldens Sverige* [Knowledge for intergration – power aspects on school and education in diversity of Sweden]. SOU 2004:33. Fritzes.
- Colliander, H. Ahn, S.-E. & Andersson P. (2018). Actions and Conceptions: Exploring Initial Literacy Teaching Practice for Adults. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*, 17(5), 306-319. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2018.1465344>
- Colliander, H. & Fejes, A. (2020). The re-emergence of Suggestopedia: teaching a second language to adult migrants in Sweden. *Language, Culture and Curriculum*, 34(1), 51–64. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07908318.2020.1767643>
- Cowie, A. & Delaney, J-A. (2019). Integration, Inclusion or Invisibility? Language Education for Adult Transnational Migrants in the UK and Germany. *Encyclopaedia – Journal of Phenomenology and Education*, 23(53), 43-52. <https://doi.org/10.6092/issn.1825-8670/9348>
- Dahlstedt, M, Colliander, H., Gruber, S. & Rydell, M. (2021). Språket som nyckel [Language as key]. In M. Dahlstedt & A. Fejes (Eds.), *Utbildning i migrationens tid – Viljor, organisering och villkor för inkludering* [Education in the time of migration – Wishes, organisation, and conditions for inclusion]. (pp. 43-68). Studentlitteratur.
- Fejes, A. (2010). Discourses on employability: Constituting the responsible citizen. *Studies in Continuing Education*, 32(2), 89-102. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0158037X.2010.488353>
- Flubacher, M.C., Duchene, A. & Corroy, R. (2018). *Language Investment and Employability: The Uneven Distribution of Resources in the Public Employment Service*. Springer.
- Franker, Q. (2007). *Bildval i alfabetiseringsundervisningen – En fråga om synsätt* [The choices of picture in initial literacy teaching – a matter of perspective]. Göteborgs Universitet.
- Fraser, N. (1987). Women, welfare and the politics of needs interpretation. *Hypatia*, 2(1), 103-121. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1527-2001.1987.tb00855.x>

- Fraser, N. (1989). *Unruly Practices: Power, Discourse, and Gender in Contemporary Social Theory*. University of Minnesota Press.
- Fraser, N. (2005, Nov/Dec). Reframing Justice in a Globalizing World. *New Left Review*, 36, 69-88.
- Fraser, N. (2010). Injustice at intersecting scales: on 'social exclusion' and 'the global poor'. *European Journal of Social Theory*, 13(3), 363-371. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368431010371758>
- Hammersley, M. & Atkinson, P. (2007). *Ethnography - Principles in practice* (3rd ed). Routledge.
- Hoffman, L., Innes, P., Wojtyńska, A. & Skaptadóttir, D. U. (2021). Adult Immigrants' Perspectives on Courses in Icelandic as a Second Language: Structure, Content, and Inclusion in the Receiving Society. *Journal of Language, Identity & Education*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15348458.2021.1988855>
- Hogan-Brun, G., Mar-Molinero, C. & Stevenson, P. (2009). *Discourses on language and integration: Critical perspectives on language testing regimes in Europe*. John Benjamins.
- Kloubert, T. & Dickerhoff, I. (2020). Learning democracy in a new society: German orientation courses for migrants through the lens of Buber's dialogical education. *European Journal for Research on the Education and Learning of Adults*, 11(3), 275-291. <https://doi.org/10.3384/rela.2000-7426.ojs1674>
- Kuusipalo, P., Toiviainen, H. & Pitkänen, P. (2021). Adult Education as a Means to Social Inclusion in Nordic Welfare States: Denmark, Finland and Sweden. In N. Kersh, H. Toiviainen, P. Pitkänen, G.K. Zarifis (Eds.), *Young Adults and Active Citizenship*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65002-5_6
- Lindberg, I. & Sandwall, K. (2007). Nobody's darling? Swedish for adult immigrants: A critical perspective. *Prospect*, 22(3), 79-95.
- Lindberg, I. & Sandwall, K. (2012). Samhälls- och undervisningsperspektiv på svenska som andraspråk för vuxna invandrare [Social and teaching perspectives on Swedish as a second language for adult migrants]. In K. Hyltenstam, M. Axelsson, & I. Lindberg (Eds.), *Flerspråkighet – en forskningsöversikt [Multilingualism – a research review]*. (pp. 368-478). Vetenskapsrådet.
- Lundgren, B. (2005). *Skolan i livet – livet i skolan [The school in life – the life in school]*. Umeå universitet.
- Milani, T., Bauer, S., Carlson, M., Spehar, A. & von Brömssen, K. (2021). Citizenship as status, habitus and acts: Language requirements and civic orientation in Sweden. *Citizenship Studies*, 25(6), 756-772. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13621025.2021.1968698>
- Norlund Shaswar, A. (2014). *Skriftbruk i vardagsliv och i sfi-utbildning [Literacy in Everyday Life and in the Swedish for Immigrants Programme]*. Umeå universitet.
- Norlund Shaswar, A. & Wedin, Å. (2019). Language learning strategies and teaching practices in adult L2 education: The case of Swedish for Immigrants. *Apples – Journal of Applied Language Studies*, 13(3), 17-34. <https://doi.org/10.17011/apples/urn.201907063590>
- Pötzsch, T. (2020). *Critical Perspectives on Social Inclusion in Integration Education Programs for Adult Migrants*. Unigrafia.
- Rosén, J. & Bagga-Gupta, S. (2015). Prata svenska vi är i Sverige! [Talk Swedish, we are in Sweden!. A study of practised language policy in adult language learning.] *Linguistics and Education*, 31, 59–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.linged.2015.05.003>
- Rydell, M. (2015). Performance and ideology in speaking tests for adult migrants. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 19(4), 535-558. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josl.12152>
- Rydell, M. & Milani, T.M. (2020). Språkrav som migrationspolitiskt verktyg [Language requirements as a tool in migration policy]. In A. Fejes & M. Dahlstedt (Eds.), *Perspektiv på skolans problem. Vad säger forskningen? [Perspective on the school problem. What does research say?]*. (pp. 139-154). Studentlitteratur.
- Slade, B.L. & Dickinson, N. (2021). Adult education and migration in Scotland: Policies and practices for inclusion. *Journal of Adult and Continuing Education*, 27(1), 100–120. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1477971419896589>
- Spandler, H. (2007). From Social Exclusion to Inclusion? A Critique of the Inclusion Imperative in Mental Health. *Medical Sociology online*, 2(2), 3-16.
- Säfström, C. A. & Biesta, G. (2011). A Manifesto for Education. *Policy Futures in Education*, 9(5), 540-547. <https://doi.org/10.2304/pfie.2011.9.5.540>
- The Swedish National Agency of Education. (2018). *Kommunal vuxenutbildning i svenska för invandrare. Kursplaner och kommentarer – reviderad 2018 [Municipal Adult Education in Swedish for immigrants. Syllabus and comments – revised 2018]*. Skolverket.
- Wedin, Å., Rosén, J. & Hennius, S. (2018). *Transspråkande multimodalitet i grundläggande skriftspråkundervisning inom sfi [Translanguaging multimodality in initial literacy teaching in SFI]*. *Pedagogisk Forskning i Sverige*, 23(1-2), 15-38.

- Wildemeersch, D. & Koulaouzides, G. (2022, September 29 – October 2). *The paradox of exclusion through inclusion. Interpreting inclusion from a critical pedagogical* [Paper presentation]. 10th triennial ESREA Conference, University of Milano Bicocca, Milano, Italy.
- Zachrisson, M. (2014). *Invisible Voices. Understanding the Sociocultural Influences on Adult Migrants' Second Language Learning and Communicative Interaction*. Malmö University and Linköping University.